



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

HAS THE INDIAN BEEN MISJUDGED?—A STUDY  
OF INDIAN CHARACTER.

IN attempting to discuss this question, I disclaim all thought of the modern Indian who has either been brought by education and force of circumstances to a life essentially that of his Caucasian neighbors, or has maintained a quasi-independence under a species of governmental paternalism and individual corruption which has rendered him a nondescript mixture of the vices of both barbarism and civilization. To see the real Indian, we must look back through two, three or four centuries of history and, even then, must view him through the media of observers untrained in those modern sciences, ethnology and sociology.

To the average settler, Spanish, Dutch, English or French, Catholic, Lutheran, Puritan or Quaker, the Indian was a means to an end, or, worse still, an obstacle between him and that end. With comparatively few exceptions, the only Europeans who took an interest in the Indian himself, were missionaries and, mainly, the Jesuits.

The southern aborigines, occupying the Gulf coast, Mexico, and tropic South America, were, for the most part, in a semi-civilized state with a political organization, sometimes monarchic, sometimes republican, but always essentially aristocratic or rather presbyteric, as the ruling class was never a stable hereditary oligarchy.\* In arts and crafts, including sculpture, architecture, engineering and hieroglyphic writing, the best of these tribes were fairly comparable with the Mediterranean peoples at the dawn of history,† 3000 or 4000 A. C. While brave and intelligent, they were not a match for the arms and treachery of the Spaniards and they have either been exterminated or have lost their identity, except among the mountainous districts. An old narrative, published in Drake's *Voyages*

---

\* "History of Conquest of Mexico and Peru."

† See "Memoirs Peabody Museum," Vol. I., Nos. 4 and 5, and Drake's "Collection of Voyages," 1767.

(1767, the narrative being much older) describes the finding of hundreds of mummified bodies of natives, on one of the small West Indies. A guide explained that a whole village had committed suicide together, rather than submit to the atrocities of the Spaniards. From numerous similar, though less striking examples, it is evident that the conquest of Mexico, Florida, Central America and Peru, as well as of the West Indies, was due rather to the Indians' indifference to life than to their fear of death.

Both the Dutch and the Quakers had considerable traffic with the northern Indians and their dealings were, on the whole, of a friendly nature though distinctly shrewd. For downright brutality, one must ever turn to the "unco' guid" and, in the history of the Puritan settlers of New England, we find slight disposition to treat the Indians save as troublesome vermin, to be exterminated, not civilized nor converted. Although the retaliation of the savages was bloody and dramatic, it was fitful and numerically insignificant and New England was practically freed from its aboriginal inhabitants within a generation or two of its settlement by the English. None of the settlers of the new world were so engrossingly religious as the Puritans, none took so much pride in general education, none had been more restive under governmental restraint at home, yet none did less for the conversion and education of the Indians and none were so devoid of scientific and social interest in the contrasts of race, language, religion and economics with which they were brought into immediate contact. The absolute, cold-blooded objectiveness with which the New England settler viewed the Indian is, if possible, more horrible than the less humane but more human selfishness of the Spaniard.

Most of our historic acquaintance with the Indian character is due to the French and, especially, to the Jesuits, though the English officials, following the example of the French, cultivated the friendship of the Iroquois league.\* The steadfastness

---

\*See official correspondence of Sir Wm. Johnson, excerpts of which can be found in Marshall's "History of Buffalo," Vol. I.; Documentary History of New York.

of the latter's allegiance even during the Revolution and after the disastrous raid of Sullivan against the Seneca villages, testifies to the wisdom of this friendly policy and to the staunchness of the Indian character. Perhaps the greatest surprise encountered by the student of Indian character is not the difference between the real and the ideal Indian but rather the difference between the Frenchmen and Englishmen of the seventeenth century and ourselves. Indeed, so far as religious and social philosophy and the artificial conveniences of life are concerned, the step from the present to the seventeenth century in Caucasian civilization, is not much shorter than from the latter to the Indian life of the stone age. Aside from purely religious topics, the point which seems most frequently and most earnestly to have engaged the criticism of the Jesuits, is the fact that the Indians did not whip their children and discipline their wives. The severest strictures are also made on certain Indian practices regarding courtship, marriage and divorce which are really entirely innocent and even admirable, bearing in mind the obvious lack of Christian ethics and European etiquette. On the other hand, it would be gross injustice to leave the impression that either the Jesuits or the French and English officials were ignorant or bigoted, according to the standards of their time. The former were certainly rigidly orthodox. They went to a strange country, endured every social and material privation, suffered from heat and cold, from lack of food, from filth and vermin, from the fatigue of long marches through forest and swamp or from paddling all day through lakes and rivers, they often endured insult from unwilling hosts and scarcely one failed to experience the martyrdom of mutilation, of fire and of stoning. If smitten on one cheek, they turned the other, thanking God for the privilege. With limbs racking in the pressure of cleft saplings, or partly stunned by the blows received in running the gauntlet, or from the midst of flames, they pleaded, not for themselves but for their enemies who knew not what they did. This sacrifice they made, not because they regarded Christianity as a desirable cult, not because they thought that in the future life the wicked or the heathen might lack in caste among his associates who had been good Christians

on earth, but because they regarded the Holy Catholic Church as the only true exponent of the Creator and because they wished to save the Indians from a hell of literal fire and physical suffering. We can scarcely imagine and, certainly, the world has never witnessed, missionary work on such a grand scale of martyrdom, emanating from a liberal Christian sect with complaisant views as to the hereafter. However we may differ dogmatically from the Jesuits, we must regard them as heroes, modest, sincere, energetic, practical and conservative. And nearly every one is shown by his writings to have been a scholar, according to the standards of his time, a man of the world in the best sense of the term, while contemporary records explain the courage and nobility of spirit of this band of martyrs, by the heritage of the bravest and noblest blood of Europe.

In order to understand the character of the northern Indian, we must first of all realize that he was a stoic, so far as physical comforts were concerned, though by no means so in other respects.\* Every Indian was a Diogenes in housing, clothing, and provender. Our own civilization is so much a matter of fashionable garments, of bath rooms, of elaborate heating and lighting devices, of methods of serving and of eating food, that it is necessary to emphasize this historic simile, in order that we may conceive of the possibility of mental, political, moral and ethical enlightenment, apart from ingenuity in devising means of maintaining creature comfort. What we profess to believe regarding the folly of taking too much thought of food, clothing and other corporeal luxuries, the Indian actually did believe and practice. He was dirty, he did not eat daintily, his clothes did not fit, his wigwam or bark house was cold and drafty at the sides and hot and smoky in the middle, but he bore these discomforts philosophically with none of the blasphemy which they would elicit from a Christian, enlightened as to the non-essentiality of material suffering, and they did not prevent him from thinking great thoughts and from doing brave and generous deeds.

---

\*See various descriptions of amusements and jocular nature of Indians in "Jesuit Relations."

While too indifferent to material wealth to be communists,\* in the modern economic sense, most of the northern Indians lived in small communities, for protection against enemies and for assistance in hunting, fishing, etc. The successful hunter, as a matter of course, invited the entire village to share his booty and, equally as a matter of course, expected the courtesy to be reciprocated. Gifts were freely made and freely asked or articles were borrowed and sometimes without the formality of asking permission.† At funerals, religious ceremonies and social functions, all joined as one great family. The absence of true communism is shown by the occasional choice of hermit or family life and by the existence of barter and a general recognition of property rights, at the summer gatherings of tribes or confederacies.‡ In short, the commonly accepted ideas in regard to "Indian giving,"§ dishonesty, mendicancy and interested mo-

---

\* "To a granary built in the maizefield, at harvest time each family carries and deposits a certain quantity, according to his ability or inclination or none at all, if he so chooses. Its purpose was that of a public treasury, supplied by a few voluntary contributions and to which every citizen has the right of free and equal access when his own private stores are consumed, to serve as a supply to fly to for succor, to assist neighboring towns whose crops may have failed, accommodate strangers or travelers, afford provisions or supplies when they go forth on hostile expeditions and for all other exigencies of state." Bartram, "Travels through Florida," 1791, quoted by A. E. Jenks in *Am. Anthropol.*, Vol. 2, N. 4, p. 681. The same is true of many other tribes.

† Tribal etiquette only required that in the absence of the owner, some trifle be left at the lodge to indicate that a friend, not an enemy had supplied his wants therefrom or enjoyed its hospitality.

‡ "In the Jesuit Relations, there is described a summer village on Lake Superior that was three leagues long. Similar villages are described in the same works while at the angle of Lake Erie and the Niagara River, there is archaeological evidence of the evidence of a similar site about two miles long which certainly could not have been occupied during severe winter weather. It should be noted that the league of the early explorers seldom amounts to more than two miles by actual survey. Probably the difficulty of traversing the unexplored territory exaggerated the impression of distance.

§ Generosity to those not related, even to the giving away of everything, entitled the Omaha to the same high rank as bravery in battle—for poverty is the greater foe.—Dorsey. *Omaha Sociology*, p. 274. 3rd Ann. Rept., Bur. Ethnol.

tives in according hospitality, are not justified by a critical study of Indian life. Indeed, the stranger, inclined to superficial observation, would find the same conclusions apparently supported by the habits existing in circles of closely related or intimately acquainted families, among most civilized races.

There has also been hasty and unwarranted generalization regarding the character of the northern Indians, on the assumption that all tribes were alike. On the contrary, the Jesuits and other early visitors to America, have noted the most marked divergencies. Many of the Canadian tribes adopted, promptly, the gentler usages of the Europeans, while the Iroquois and especially the Mohawks were fierce and hostile to the immigration of the whites for many generations. Indeed, the very name Mohawk\* is not the tribal name at all, but a corruption of the word for cannibal applied by their enemies. The Jesuits mention one tribe as inveterate thieves who considered it a reproach, not to their honor but to their skill, to be detected, while another tribe were so honest that locks were unnecessary. In one little community, it was the custom to say all sorts of slanderous things behind a man's back, not, as the missionary takes pains to explain, from a spirit of malice but merely to afford amusement. In this community, practical jokes were constantly being played, while other tribes are described as serious in their life and conversation. Some tribes were almost prudish, others shocked the Jesuits with their coarseness, but it does not appear that any equalled the average civilized Christian in lewdness. The perpetuation of prurient ideas in articles of clay and stone† was extremely rare. I have personally seen only three such relics and these are of very doubtful authenticity. What a contrast with the arts and crafts of European civilization, either Pagan or Christian!

The Indian woman‡ is commonly pictured as the drudge of

---

\*See note by Dr. Beauchamp in "Jesuit Relations."

†Brinton—"The American Race," p. 214.

‡"Among the Five Nations and Susquehannocks certain grave matrons of the tribe had the right to sit in the councils, and among other privileges, had that of proposing a cessation of hostilities in time of war. A proposition from them to drop the warclub could be entertained without

the household, while her idle brute of a husband loafed and smoked and told stories, except when he was enjoying the excitement of hunting, fishing or the nobler sport of war. Nothing could be farther from the truth. As in all social systems, unless we have to except the last generation of our own, the Indian recognized that there were certain lines of work which belonged to woman, certain others to man. Naturally enough, in their hardy, out-door life, more actual manual labor, including the cultivation of their scanty crops, fell to the lot of woman than in our own society. But this labor, at the worst, did not involve the strain upon mind and body which we view with so much complacency in our women teachers, stenographers, clerks and other business women; it did not involve as many hours daily as the tasks of the average American housewife, the work in the fields was not as arduous nor as protracted as that which is to-day performed by women in the market gardens about every large American city. On the other hand, it must be borne in mind that hunting and fishing were the serious business of the Indian man, not his recreation, that they involved in the winter, exposure to cold and fatigue, often on an empty stomach, such as we can scarcely realize, and that, allowing for some differences in customs, the division of labor among the Indians was precisely as among ourselves, bread-

---

compromising the reputation of the tribe for bravery. There was an official orator and messenger whose appointed duty it was to convey such a pacific message from the matrons, and to negotiate for peace. . . . . The Iroquois sent messengers to the Delawares with the following speech: 'It is not well that all nations should war. . . . Let one nation be the Woman. We will place her in the middle, and the war nations shall be the Men and dwell around her. No one shall harm the Woman, and if one does, we will speak to him and say, "Why strikest thou the Woman?" . . . . . When the men around her strike one another and the strife waxes hot, the Woman shall have power to say: "Ye Men; what do ye that ye thus strike one another? Remember that your wives and children must perish, if you do not cease." Then the Men shall listen to the Woman and obey her. . . . . We hang on your arm a calabash of oil and medicine. With the oil, you shall cleanse the ears of other nations, that they listen to good and not to evil. The medicine you shall use for those nations who have been foolish, that they may return to their senses, and turn their hearts to peace.'—Brinton: "The Lenâpé and their Legends," pp. 109-III.

winning and protection being the function of the man, domestic duties of the woman. Perhaps the best evidence that the Indian woman was not abused is that her work was absolutely under her control, interference by the men not being tolerated, that she was free from domination by her husband, so free indeed, that she could leave him whenever she saw fit, and that she possessed an influence in public affairs which Caucasian society has, thus far, attained only in isolated instances as in some of the western United States. While we may agree with the European pioneers that the Indians were at fault in allowing their children to grow up without discipline, our own development has been away from the dictum of Solomon and toward the idea of the Indian, that the child should not be struck and that he should be coerced only in extreme cases. It is contrary to all reason to suppose that, with this marked deference to the rights of childhood, the Indian should have shown less consideration for the woman.

Curiously enough, some facts that may be taken as examples of the enlightened treatment of woman, may also be used in condemnation of the moral status of the Indian. The freedom of the Indian woman, after, as well as before marriage, was so great that divorce was, necessarily, a simple matter and Indian marriages had not that theoretic permanence characteristic of Christian communities. Thus, instances are mentioned in which women abandoned their sick husbands for other men or in which marriages were dissolved by the husband or by mutual consent without adequate cause. But, as a parallel, may be mentioned a recent Ohio case, in which a woman of means, sued for divorce for non-support from a sick husband, while the laxity of the divorce laws of some of our States is a public scandal. As a general rule, it appears that, practically, the marriages of the Indians were as stable and as happy as in more highly civilized countries.

Indian heredity was through female lines. This fact, as well as the custom among some tribes of preferring for succession to a chief, his sisters' children to his nephews by a brother or even his own sons, has often been construed as indicating a general state of immorality. We must remember, however,

that many civilized states have hedged the succession to the throne with precautions similar in intent, if not in detail. The semi-public accouchement of the queen of Spain, still nominally in practice, may be cited. That some Indian communities were extremely licentious, is well established, but we have no more right to generalize to the detriment of the Indian character, than to condemn our own population indiscriminately because of the existence of local centres of gross immorality. Heredity through the mother is logical, both physiologically and as a matter of sentiment, and the crude deduction drawn from the more rational practice of the Indians reacts to show the foulness of some of the civilized critics. Among many tribes, especially in the south, the most rigid legal protection was afforded to virtue,\* and, where this was lacking, it was only exceptionally that general immorality existed.

While the Indians were lacking in many of the niceties of European etiquette, they won the admiration of all observers for dignity of bearing, especially in council, for eloquence and rhetoric skill, and for genuine politeness. While possessing an etiquette of their own, elaborate enough to bear witness to considerable advancement in the amenities of thought and action, they were too logical to regard it with the superstitious veneration noticed by Europeans in their dealings with eastern peoples. Thus, the formalities of councils, funerals and other gatherings were modified to suit special circumstances, and the failure of the white man to observe Indian customs provoked no such intolerant wrath as has caused disastrous results in China, India and other Asiatic countries.

The religion of the Indians differed considerably in different tribes, and the legends were subject to wide local variations. While most tribes had superstitions regarding the supernatural origin of the phenomena of nature, and supported a class of religious charlatans, individual scepticism was quite frequent in regard to myths and sacerdotal healing, though atheism was rare. The conceptions of a supreme creative spirit—without

---

\*Voyage to Panama in Drake's "Voyages," 1767.

the carnal attributes of the majority of Pagan cults—of a spirit land where the good, at least, led a life similar to the present but on a higher and less stringent scale, the duty of sacrifice of small portions of meat, tobacco, etc., before enjoying such blessings, and the imperative duty of fulfilling literally whatever message should be sent in dreams, all these conceptions were generally held by the aborigines of the middle belt of North America. As compared with other religions, it is singular how closely this development of western wilds was in touch with the highest ethical ideals of eastern civilization.\* There was respect for the dead but no worship of ancestors. The ritual was scant and so liable to modification as to prove its non-essentiality. There was none of the idea of *quid pro quo* in making sacrifices, but rather the spirit of gratitude and courtesy and the small amounts of food and tobacco employed show the purely symbolic nature of the sacrifice, which was simply a "grace before meat." The most peculiar and characteristic idea of religious duty was the belief that dreams were messages from on high and must be literally fulfilled, even at the cost of great trouble and personal danger. Different tribes differed much in the conscientiousness with which this duty was performed and, as is the case with all religions, the sternest and hardest natures were the most punctilious. A Seneca, for example, dreamed that he, and ten companions, dived into deep water through a hole chopped in the ice, emerging at some distance from under the ice. He immediately gave a feast, invited ten friends and informed them of his dream.† All consented to aid him in his religious duty, in spite of the discomfort and actual danger involved, and the dream was fulfilled, at the cost of a human life. More frequently, the sacrifice asked was of property, and we may well suspect that certain hypo-

---

\*"Their own faiths, though lower in form, had in them the germs of a religious and moral evolution, more likely with proper regulation, to lead these people to a higher plane of thought than the Arian doctrines which were forced upon them. . . . The heathendoms of America were very far from wanting living seeds of sound morality and healthy mental education."—Brinton—"American Hero Myths," p. 231.

†"Jesuit Relations."

crites pretended to have dreams in order to secure gifts of coveted articles. Yet it is impossible that this religious custom could have persisted, unless by the general support of sincere conviction and good faith. Whatever view we may hold as to the rationality of such a superstition, we must admire and respect the spirit of implicit obedience to a higher power, and the willingness to make sacrifices and suffer martyrdom, not only to save one's own soul but to ward off disaster from another. "Greater love hath no man than this, that a man lay down his life for his friends." Even cannibalism, which arouses the greatest horror in civilized minds, exists as a sort of sacrament among nearly all savages and was practised by the American aboriginies with the belief that the virtues and valor of an enemy were thus absorbed. The Jesuits had the utmost difficulty in reconciling their interdiction of cannibalism with the belief in the transsubstantiation of the elements of the Host, just as in distinguishing between the elaborate symbolism of the Church and idolatry, which was entirely foreign to the religious spirit of the Indian. Indeed, when we consider how much better adapted to the comprehension and habits of thought of the Indian, were the simpler ritual and beliefs of the Protestants, it is a remarkable testimony to the perseverance and devotion of the Catholic missionaries, that the only genuine progress made toward the Christianization of the new world during the seventeenth century was due to them.

Although able, by means of an ingenious system of ideograms,\* to communicate simple and practical ideas and even to keep a fairly accurate history of events, the northern Indians were illiterate. But before assigning them a low place in linguistic development, we must consider that the average Greek of the golden age understood only oral language. Yet the latter was a cultured individual, by reason of the complexity of the Greek grammar and his high standards of rhetoric. Likewise, the American Indian spoke a language which recognized

---

\*"Bureau of Ethnology Report," 1892-93, and 1883-84; Malloy's "Account of Pictographs of North American Indians;" page 88. same volume. Winter count on buffalo-robe verified by contemporaneous history for over 100 years.

clearly the various parts of speech, which possessed elaborate inflections and which was peculiarly rich in vocabulary† on account of differentiations of ideas and distinctions between literal and figurative meanings, far beyond the capabilities of any Aryan tongue. The difficulties which the Jesuits experienced in learning the native dialects, were not merely those of unfamiliarity and lack of interpreters, nor were they the difficulties of ignorant men, incapable of appreciating idioms and methods of analysis not found in their mother tongue. Most of the missionaries were well versed in Latin, Greek and one or more modern languages beside their own. They were men of the highest intellectual training of their day, when language study occupied a much greater part of the curriculum than at present, and their testimony regarding the perfection of the Indian language must be considered that of experts. The fact that elaborate inflections and fine rhetoric distinctions were perpetuated among the Indians, marks a degree of erudition and of logical development, which cannot be swept away by our modern prejudice against the inability to commit speech to more or less phonetic writing. Almost every Indian could write, though not so as to reproduce words; he spoke according to well-formulated standards, a language far more complex than any used by his more civilized conquerors; in most instances he was familiar with several allied dialects and, often, with distinct native tongues. He learned the language of the Europeans more readily than the latter learned his.

While the concept of the government of the individual was conspicuous by its absence among the Indians, intertribal law was well fixed, though often on radically different lines from the international law of the Old World. The amalgamation of the United States more closely resembles the league of the Iroquois than it does any republic or confederation of Europe.

---

†Vocabulary of Menominee Indians, Bureau of Ethnology Reports, 1892-93. See also Wright's "Grammar and Dictionary of the Senecas," Sioux alphabet, "Bureau of Ethnology Report," 1881-82; "Essays of an Americanist," by Brinton. Recent reports of study of Patagonian dialects; manuscript grammars, dictionaries, etc., more or less complete, in custody of Rev. Arthur E. Jones, S. J., St. Mary's College, Montreal.

One of the strongest factors in unofficial modern life is the existence of fraternities with chapters in different localities. This feature, instead of being unrecognized by or even at variance with formal executive and legislative powers, as among ourselves, was an integral part of the government of the Indians, though it became conspicuous only among the Iroquois. Running through the five sovereign states or tribes of the Iroquois confederacy, were clans,\* named after natural objects, which constituted huge artificial families. So real was the fraternal spirit thus engendered that a member of one tribe was assured of hospitality among others, marriage between members of the same clan was considered incestuous and, most important of all, any threatened strife between sovereign tribes was prevented by the thought that this would necessarily involve fratricide. One of the cardinal principles of Indian polity was the absolute separation of civil and military offices.† The peace sachem took his bow and arrows and tomahawk and followed the war-chief as a humble warrior. The leader in battle took his seat in the council, merely as a member of the tribe. The inestimable loss of money and lives that our country suffered even during the brief Spanish-American war, to say nothing of previous struggles with intervening periods of political reward for military heroes, may serve to illustrate that the aborigines were not in all respects our inferiors.

The Indian has been accused of cruelty, especially in regard to the torture of prisoners of war. While the accusation is literally true according to present standards, much of the odium disappears if we compare the Indian, not with ourselves but with our European ancestors of even a few centuries ago. The international ethics of the Indian differed materially from that of most Caucasian nations. Formal declarations of war were less often made, the person of an ambassador was not considered sacred, and the torture of prisoners, though brutal and cowardly from our standpoint, was considered by the Indians

---

\*Morgan's "League of the Iroquois."

†Morgan's "League of the Iroquois," "Jesuit Relations," and O. H. Marshall's "History of Buffalo," Vol. I.

themselves very much as our forefathers looked upon the physical suffering of the tournament. Every warrior regarded death by torture as a possible and glorious, though doubtless scarcely desirable ending. In anticipation of death in open battle, he wore a scalp lock for the convenience of his successful enemy. In anticipation of death by torture, he nerved himself to the ordeal and, when the time came, took pride in bearing mutilations without flinching and even in inciting his captors to additional cruelties by recounting his own exploits in the field of battle and in the torture-council. Frequently it happened that, on account of some sudden fancy of his captors, or the desire of some recently bereaved family to replace a parent, son or brother, the victim was liberated and he then became a member in full standing, of the family, clan and tribe of his adoption. Sometimes the victim escaped and, if he afterward encountered his former tormentors, in time of peace, he had no inclination to take revenge upon them, regarding them simply as the victors in a fair, though, to our minds, uneven contest. When we contrast the tortures of the Indian with those prevalent among European nations in the middle ages, we find them no more brutal nor painful and, while in both cases, the victim was overwhelmed by superior forces, the Indian had previously enjoyed a fair field and no favors, while our more highly civilized Christian predecessors, tortured those who were entirely helpless. But, the salient difference is this, that the Indian torture was simply a development of a normal love of fighting, whereas the tortures of advanced, European civilization fouled the fair name of religion and law, the two powers which ought preeminently to stand for mercy and justice. At the time when the Jesuits came in contact with the Indians, the inquisition of the Church of Rome was comparatively recent history, while similar cruelties had been perpetrated by the established churches of England and Scotland, since the discovery of America. Cruelties, only a little less horrible, marked the differences of religious opinion among kinsmen in New England, the Protestant Dutch tortured English captives late in the eighteenth century, and the extortion of testimony under force of pain, prevailed at least in Italy and Rus-

sia, into the nineteenth century. Even in the American Revolution, gross violation of the ethics of civilized warfare may be charged to both sides, and our pioneer history is full of instances in which unprovoked torture and murder characterized our dealings with the Indians. All facts considered, it is scarcely necessary to plead for the Indian, his position in the stone age, separated from ourselves by thousands of years of the natural process of evolution.

A. L. BENEDICT.

BUFFALO.

---

## DISCUSSIONS.

### A FURTHER REPLY TO MR. J. M. ROBERTSON.

My rejoinder to Mr. Robertson's "Reply" in the July number will be very brief. In his paragraph I. on p. 506, Mr. Robertson argues that because, borrowing for once a word I have seen used more than once in writings of his own, I spoke of a "blatant" faction, I therefore was "vituperating" a number of persons whom he names—persons for many of whom I have the greatest respect, based on a knowledge of their works and in some cases of themselves. His argument is doubly fallacious. (1) It does not follow that what may be predicated of a collective whole can be predicated of every individual who in any sense belongs to that whole. If an historian of recent events were to record that "London rejoiced in the boisterous fashion of 'Merry England' over the relief of heroic Mafeking," he would not necessarily be asserting that Mr. John M. Robertson had so rejoiced. Mr. Robertson has supplied me with a good specimen of the fallacy of Division, for which I should be duly grateful as a Professor of Logic (not of Moral Philosophy, as he says on p. 510—inaccurate in a matter which is irrelevant to the discussion, but on which verification would not have taken much trouble). (2) To refer only to responsible politicians whose views are sufficiently known—Mr. Morley and Mr. Bryce have accepted the annexation of the South African republics as now inevitable and they, with the great mass of the Liberal party, do not therefore belong to the *small* but very

Vol. XII—No. 1